

BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE 1 CLEANUP TEAM MEETING 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 ~ 9 MINUTES OF THE BRAC CLEANUP TEAM MEETING held 10 on the 7th day of September, 1995, commencing at 11 1:00 p.m. at Richards-Gebaur Air Force Base, Building No. 926, 15471 Hangar Road, Kansas City, 12 13 Missouri. 14 15 16 PRESENT: 17 18 Mr. Garey Reeves, Mr. Mark Esch, Mr. Robert 19 Lodato, Ms. Ellen Valade, Mr. Bob Zuiss, Mr. Jimmy 20 Thompson, Ms. Jana Ryan, Mr. Robert M. Geller, Mr. 21 Glenn Golson and Mr. Wayne Mizer. ORIGINAL 22 23 Minutes produced by Lynn R. Hicks of Hostetler & Associates, Inc., 9200 W. 67th Street, Shawnee 24 25 Mission, Kansas 66202.



	•	2 105	2
1	INDEX		
2		Page	
3	IRP Sites (Blue)	3	
4	Compliance Sites (Green)	8	
5	Areas of Concern (Red)	10	
6	Report by Ms. Valade	14	
7	Report by Mr. Zuiss	17	
8	Report by Mr. Esch	18	
9	Corrections to 7/26/95 Meeting Minutes	19	
10	Report by Mr. Thompson	20	
11	Cleanup Levels on POL Yard	23	
12	BCT Team Improvement	24	
13	Funding Status of 1996 Projects	24	
14	1997 Projects	25	
15	Actions Taken Near Building 620	25	
16	Sanitary Sewer Permits & KC Visit	26	
17	Schedule Next BCT Meeting Date	2 6	
18	Open Floor Discussion	27	
19	Meeting Adjourned	29	
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			



Participants of the meeting were briefed
by Mr. Esch on the status of the IRP sites,
compliance sites and areas of concern as follows:
IRP SITES (Blue)

1. BELTON TRAINING COMPLEX

В

In the original EBS contract the waste contractor identified various munition types of waste. In 1996 a PA/SI will be performed, with follow-up as indicated by that study. In 1997 will do-an RI/PS: a RI/FS will be done.

The Air Force Reserve will oversee the EOD survey of the Belton Training Complex. The contractor has the work plan and is ready to go, but funding has not come through yet. The original survey is to be expanded to incorporate all of the Belton Training Complex, to identify hot spots and come up with the work plan focused on EOD disposal. Major Command has responsibility to safe the area, after which it will be turned over for any environmental. (non-IRP site)

The weapons storage area still requires safing but doesn't have any environmental issues.

There is no work plan other than it is included in the safing that Major Command will perform.

The contractor is going to take the past



statement of work and expand on that and use it in the same context, so the work plan isn't going to change that much from the original statement of work when they did the original survey.

If there is an environmental issue after completion of the survey then we would proceed on with the statement of work. If it involves EOD disposal then Major Command will develop statement of work for disposal. If EOD is found, the PA/SI would probably be delayed.

2. NORTH BURN PIT

Waiting on cleanup standards from the State for the perched water systems and soil.

Once the ARARs are received the BCT will look at the data and standards that have been developed and decide where to go. Discussion was had regarding whether the north burn pit was cleaned up to a typical industrial level and that some residential settings.

Indications are that the lead levels from MDOH was 1600 parts per million and the lead level found on the site was 520.ppm

MDNR will try to come up with the numbers for the burn area, but there are some lead



issues	that	are	different	t h'a n	the	POL	petroleum
product	ts.						ıd

This is not a project now and will not s.

develop work plan until levels are provided.

- 3. OIL SATURATED AREA and
- 4. HAZARDOUS WASTE DRUM STORAGE

Mr. Esch's understanding is that MDNR has basically agreed that no more action is required on the soil at both sites, with the maximum remaining contaminant as far as TPH at 53 pm, and the standard to meet was 200. There was a decision document written to do no further action based on recommendations of prior contractors that there was no need to worry about the ground water.

On 8/31/95 a ground water project was awarded to collect the ground water by either hydropunch or water wells at both sites. Cleanup levels on ground water are needed. Mr. Geller indicates MCLs are what they look at and that if the ground water is contaminated above the MCLs it may require going back in and working on the soil.

- 5. HAZARDOUS MATERIALS STORAGE AREA
- The Base went after soil contamination



and r	emoved	about	64 cu	bic yar	ds.	Again,	ground-
					On	عـ	
water	would	be the	e issu	e here.	48/3	1/95 [∴] c	ontract
to do	hydrop	ounch o	or mon	itoring	well	s to c	ollect
	^			1 +			
groun	dwater	r sampl	les. W	ma jeli			

6. LEAKING USTs and

7. TEST CELL AREA

Mr. Esch and Mr. Golson went-over the statements of work and sent it to AFCEE, (who developed the statement of work) and put out the proposal known as Delivery Order 3. It's in final negotiations at AFCEE and is expected to be awarded sometime in September to Dames & Moore, at which point they will develop a work plan based on the scope of work.

During BCT working group meeting their work plan will be reviewed. Mr. Mizer says the area next to the operations they're going to confirm the existing levels and cap the pipes.

The other area, where they think they spotted a
near
leak when going for the eye-wash station, they're
probably going to have to dig it up, do some
testing and see what it is.

Since there is some excavation portion the work to that plan there is a need for coordination on



cleanup levels. [before writing the WP]

8. FIRE VALVE AREA

BCT has decided there is no problem with soil levels and that no further action on the soil was appropriate after Δ briefing by Tetra Tech.

Expecting the final PA/SI within the next month, and followed by responses to comments that MDNR has

Ground water will be investigated under the 8/31/95 contract using either hydropunch or monitoring wells. If there is contamination in the ground water MDNR will be looking at the soil.

According to Ms. Valade the remediation of the fire plug area is in the process of being formally removed from the contract since they're closing out that delivery order next week.

Mr. Golson is concerned that this sixe is very close to the electric shop and questions whether PCBs were looked at as well as TPH, there having been evidence of oil going down the floor drain of the electric shop. Mr. Esch suggests that a local sampling contract which will be in place in October could be used to fill in data gaps. Mr. Golson says there needs to be a couple samples taken for PCBs in that area.



COMPLIANCE SITES (Green)

1. UST CLOSURE BUILDING 962

All that is left to do on this site, since nothing was found, is the typical underground storage tank closure with no further response action required, which is to submit a final report to UST on the permanent closure of those two tanks, 962A and 962B. Dames & Moore is writing the closure report and will send it to Mr. Esch for informal approval and then go through contracting for distribution. Sampling found basically non-detects.

2. OIL/WATER SEPARATOR 9470 9470 %

Mr. Esch discusses the weaning of the flow that's going into the sanitary sewers. If a low flow sample was approved by the water quality [MDNA] division it could be disconnected from the oil/water separator and turned into the stream that goes into Scope Creek. The flow going directly into the oil/water separator comes from the following: storm water that goes into the pond; from the diked-in areas around the POL; a

108 9 depressions 9 houses that fill and flow overland into the creek; 1 sewage Astorm water and industrial that come off the 2 buildings and the flight line. There are two 3 into the sanitary sewer inlets. Here we are referring to just the pond and the POL yard and the storm water that comes 5 off of those; taking those off the oil/water 6 separator and turning those back into a surface discharge. 8 project This is projected to be a two-years or 9 three-year item that will take place after the POL 10 There is a '97 project for taking 11 remediation. that section of water off of the oil/water 12 separator and to do any type of NPDES/storm water/ 13 14 sanitary requirements that get identified, as well as requirements from the Kansas City Sewer 15 Department. There is no statement of work. developed yet 16 17

18 3. POL YARD

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

and done soil gas surveys. There might be some during cleanup.

data gaps that will be addressed. The base
environmental engineer has collected samples in
addition to samples collected by the contractor.

There is a work plan to remediate the site. This
is not an NPL site or a RCRA site.



2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

OIL/WATER SEPARATOR 704

When 211 cubic yards of soil were removed they replaced this oil/water separator. There is agreement that this oil/water separator will not be removed to address some minor contamination below it. Ground water needs to be contamination is in the looked at and an assessment of what that ground This will be included with the four other IRP sites that haveAground water assessment going on.

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

AREAS OF CONCERN (Red)

- 1. STRESSED VEGETATION BUILDING 918 and
- 15 2. STRESSED VEGETATION BUILDING 603

Local sampling contractor will be told to collect samples of PCB, TPH, volatiles, pesticides, et cetera. Ms. Valade says the BPA should be in place in October. There should be no problem working together to identify the means to go through some type of local contractor to characterize these areas of concern. Once there is an agreement on what samples will be collected MDNR wants to be notified of planned dates so that they have the opportunity to take their own or



take a split and check.

QA/QC was discussed. Ms. Valade says the way this is set up is a very basic statement of work to do water samples, soil samples, within certain requirements and regulations; the lab has to be certified; the first order under the purchase order is to provide their QA/QC plan, which we approve; and what we get back is the laboratory report. Request will be made that they inform us exactly when they're going to do the sample, and that can be added to the statement of work. We have local control over their times.

MDNR would like to review and respond to the QA/QC and sampling protocol of the lab before the lab is accepted.

16

17

18

19

20

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

3. BUILDING 704 OUTFALL and

4. BUILDING 944 OUTFALL and
BUILDING 927 OUTFALL

Building 704 was constructed in '55.

Building 944 is an old demolished test stand.

21 | These oil/water separators were constructed in

22 | 1955 or earlier, and for twenty years the outfall

23 went directly into the storm system. After the

24 Clean Water Act, it got turned into the sanitary.

Need to decide what kind of indicator compounds to

ffluent was sent



are

--:

1	look for at the outfalls. There is no fund in profite
2	A line for this. This is a sampling issue. $\int_{0}^{\infty} r^{2n} dr^{2n} $
3	MDNR needs identification of the
4	location of all the old oil/water separators that
5	were closed out and then some correlation to what
6	buildings they would drain so that a sampling plan
7	can be designed that looks for the proper
8	constituents. They need either a map that fairly
9	clearly identifies it or some kind of a narrative
10	to go along with it. They are not requesting a
11	work plan, but just kind of background
12	information. It is decided that the historical
13	uses of those buildings and the gathering of this
14	information could be done in working group.
15	
16	5. DRAINAGE POND
17	Comments on the draft were received back
18	from MDNR and were sent to the contractor to
19	respond to the comments. A no further action
20	planned document has been submitted. No comments
21	have been received from MDNR on the no further

23

24

25

22

6. CENTRAL DRAINAGE AREA

action document.

The contract has been awarded to Versar. INC.



The work plan has been submitted to MDNR, and MDNR comments have beer received. Versar is in the process of responding to those comments. Foresee in the near future a finalized work plan and the collection of the 39-some-odd samples. The Versar contracts are under the purview of the contracting officer at AFCEE at Brooks. An on-site field quality inspector correspondent has not been assigned yet.

Mr. Geller requests that MDNR's comments be responded to before the contractor starts work.

Mr. Esch says that no notice to proceed will be issued until there is concurrence by both MDNR and EPA.

Bech. Ms. Valade cautions that even if the notice to proceed is given after concurrence there may not be any local oversight for information on a day-to-day basis, but this is something she would be requesting from them.

7. TARMAC FUEL LINE

These were the termination points of the fuel hydrant system. There has been no investigation of the hydrant system that went out to the fuel head and no investigation of the fuel spill. A fire department report reveals that 60 or 70 gallons of fuel were hosed down. Need a



working group meeting to determine what the local contractor needs to look for at this site.

8. UST 927

Contractor previously removed 14 storage tanks (including 620). Through the local contractor the working group will select four tanks to sample. If any one of them come up as an indicator that something is different than the samples that were collected earlier, then sampling will be done of all the tanks. These tanks are all located in the retained property by the Air Force and were removed prior to underground storage tank regulation.

REPORT BY MS. VALADE

Delivery Order 2, which is the hydrant remediation, the UST removal and the basewide hazardous waste disposal, All on-site work from a contracting standpoint is presumed to be completed and the contractor has demobilized the sites.

There is still one drum of soil samples in the old hazardous materials storage yard, which is scheduled to be taken care of very quickly. From that point they will be closing out contractually.



and the one site work will be considered completed. There will be final reports, tests, et cetera, that will be sent to Ms. Valade and she will get them to Mr. Esch.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Area 620 was treated as a hazardous waste disposal item, so closure reports or amendments to the previous closure reports will 40 🚁 Mr. Eschi The test reports of what they took out and what they found they went a live They went a little bit further on the samplings so they didn't have Aubia Let th to dig it up again. Almost twenty items is expected to be completed in the next two or three weeks and the test reports will take a little longer than that. The contractor's reports are in the works right now. After Mr. Esch receives the reports he will update the closure report that was previously submitted and then resubmit that closure report to merMWR'UST beared

Ms. Valade reports that the only problem

from closing out this delivery order will be the

fire valve area, as this was pulled out of the

scheduling. No on-site work was done, but they

had previously worked on plans. A decision needs

to be made on whether to leave this open or start

all over again. If sparging were necessary it



would be within the scope of the contract, because 1 the contract involves all remediation, which gives 2 a lot of flexibility in the delivery orders. 3 hydrant, the UST, 620 and the clean-out of the fuel lines should all be closed by the end of 5 6 Valade does not have 8 administration on the POL yard but reports that in the next six weeks the comments are due back on 9 10 the work plan and then the contractor will work on answering those comments. 11 It is understood that the contractor has one week to incorporate their 12 13 comments and get them back to Ms. Valade. those comments are in and approved then they will 14 begin on-site work 15 16 Cleanup levels were given to them at the 200 level 17 based on previous discussion, so that's going to 18 have to be firmed up. 19 Delivery Order 3, 🖚 and 20 due to be awarded and in final negotiations 21 Following that the work plans will be due and will 22 go into the 45-day review period. 23 for sampling and remediation. 24 Within the next six weeks the sampling



blanket purchase agreements should be in place,

25

ready to place calls against.. Hopefully by

October time frame the projects can be placed in a priority order so that in November calls can be placed. Once the BPAs are established they're good for five years and is the fastest way to get something done.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

REPORT BY MR. ZUISS

A general, non-fee permit has been requested from the Kansas City Sewer District to sanitary. discharge the remediation waters into the sewer. The city will be notified of the quantities and analytical results of the discharge. This will cover the discharge in the POL yard if there is excess water that is developed. The city's big picture concern is to try to reduce the volumes that they're treating at the treatment plant. , in the drained area one-inch rainfall costs \$2,500 to treat, so a reduction in volume volumes that they can reduce will reduce their Nothing different will be done as far as routing storm water; everything still goes like it has been, but now there's a permit. Once clean-up is done there will still be a team approach by the city, the Air Force and the State as to what will be done with that drained area in the future.



2.2

REPORT BY MR. ESCH

The Tetra Tech contract terminates at the end of this month. They are in the process of finalizing and responding to MDNR comments on the PA/SI at Site 9, the fire valve area and the pond assessment. Their response of how they're going to incorporate MDNR's comments in the final reports is expected within two weeks. There will be a ten-day turnaround to make sure MDNR's comments were incorporated correctly and get a final report from them.

Ms. Valade is working on the sampling contract for AOCs. The BCT will be given the laboratory quality assurance plan to review and consider.

Versar has been awarded two projects.

One of them is the central drainage area work plan that they have drafted. Comments from MDNR have been received. We're waiting for responses to those comments. Our next phase will be the ten-day phase on incorporating comments, and at that point will be looking for approval. A notice to proceed will not happen until MDNR concurs that all comments will be incorporated. After the



notice to proceed they should be in the field within one to two weeks collecting samples.

Versar was also awarded the contract to do a ground water study on Sites 3, 4, 6, 9, and the oil/water separator at 704. This is the current scope of work on that one. A first draft of their work plan should be sent out in about a month to maybe a month and a half.

Headquarters has pushed the asbestos survey of all buildings from a '96 project into the '95 program. A list has been developed of all of the buildings that need to be resurveyed and update that '87 survey. Within a month the proposal to the contractor will go out and they will get a proposal back on costs. This item is primarily OSHA compliance and our responsibility to notify our lessees of the condition of the buildings.

CORRECTIONS TO MEETING MINUTES OF JULY 26, 1995

Regarding tank 620A that was pulled,
Mr. Geller saw that there was no discussion of the
actual excavation and disposal of the waste
material, and that the references as identified
and discussed in that BCT were clearly related to



the residuals from sampling. He also has not received a copy of the Air Force guidance document.

Mr. Esch's understanding is that he had relayed during that meeting the plan to go forward under the hazardous waste contract to remove that soil, and had also mentioned plans to go to the fire training area and clean out the piping. A copy of the Air Force handbook has not been sent yet.

REPORT BY MR. THOMPSON

Mr. Thompson reports that the Corps of Engineers is looking at the POL storage area. COE has one tank, whereas the Air Force still has the property for three tanks. There has been some preliminary sampling done in the vicinity of the COE tank. Mr. Golson agrees there was no contamination found.

The thought at this point is that if there were a need or requirement for the tank to be removed, rather than having two contractors and two projects going side-by-side, either the Air Force or COE could convey funds and authority to the other and get it all into one contract. At



this point, if this initial sampling is clean and not finding anything that would require removing the structure, it will stay.

ö

: 9

Mr. Esch points out that if there is no contamination underneath the structure the Department of Defense is forbidden by law to demolish it, so at this point that tank will probably remain after the POL yard has been cleaned up.

Mr. Geller inquires whether the Corps has looked at the potential cost to remove the tank, should there be contamination that extends under the tank that wasn't previously identified, whether their contract could be modified and their funds moved over for demolishing the tank and proceeding. Mr. Thompson feels there would not be a problem and will talk with COE contract people and the project manager and work together with them. It is unknown whether the Air Force would be able to let COE put their money over there and give them the authority to go ahead and do it, and probably one of the first questions that would be asked is what kind of contractor they have.

Mr. Esch says the money that the Corps

MIPERs to AFCEE has to have the same restrictions



as BRAC money and has to be a multi-year fund.

There's also the legal question of access to the property and the salvage value of the tank goes to the owner, et cetera.

Should contamination be found Mr. Geller would like to make sure there is a mechanism in order to implement it fairly easily, and this should be kept in mind in case contamination extends off the property. Mr. Esch says it would be a simple matter to get a right of entry letter from the Kansas City Aviation Department to pursue the contaminant. Mr. Thompson and Mr. Esch agree that their responsibility doesn't stop at a property line.

Mr. Geller says it could lead to the fact that maybe the tank needs to come down in order to chase the same plume, even though it wasn't identified in preliminary samples, and would like to pursue some of those issues to get an understanding of what's going to happen and who is going to chase what plumes. Mr. Esch feels there is latitude in the cost-plus type contracts to take care of it, as long as the paperwork is in order, and would probably use BRAC money, possibly working out some sort of reimbursement later with



the Corps.

At this point there is no plan to do anything with that facility unless there is a need to clean up a plume or there's some contamination under the tank that warrants remediation. There is a single pump house associated with the tank.

No samples were taken around the pump house.

Question was raised concerning the berms and piping associated with the pump house. Mr. Esch says they will stop taking appurtenances out at the property line if there is no contamination.

If contaminants are along the appurtenance corridor they would again chase the pathway to where the origin is. There still could be the possibility of pulling out the pump house as well.

Mr. Esch understands there is a letter regarding carte blanche access agreement from Kansas City to AFBCA.

CLEANUP LEVELS ON POL YARD

MDNR has a goal of one month to provide risk base numbers for solid waste, hazardous waste, water pollution control, for the cleanup of petroleum type products. Dames & Moore's work plan is due to be done and returned to them with



comments in about a month. They need limited notice to proceed to begin asbestos abatement testing and bench-scale treatment of soil.

BCT TEAM IMPROVEMENT

There was a commitment by the AFBCA to implement some new procedures in order to inform the State. MDNR considers those to be acceptable and will be watching to see that they're implemented.

FUNDING STATUS OF 1996 PROJECTS

It had been previously mentioned that half of the IRP money had been cut from the program by Air Staff. AFBCA has sent a document that said they at least plan for '96 and '97 to fully fund those projects.

survey of all buildings. 2) An iffy project to remove and close some of the monitoring wells, if it's agreed they're no longer necessary on sites that have been closed (might slip to '97).

3) Local sampling contract. 4) Preliminarily scheduled a response action for the test cell area, Site 8. 5) If ground water problems found



at Site 9 there is an kI/FS on the books to address what the proper response is going to be and conduct a feasibility study on whatever actions will be taken. 6) Preliminary assessment and site inspection at Belton training annex.

Mr. Esch will send MDNR a copy of the record of decision signed by the secretary of the Air Force.

1997 PROJECTS

NPDES compliance, which is a full-blown water issues project. 2) The RI/FS at the Belton area.
 Additional sampling contract.

ACTIONS TAKEN NEAR BUILDING 620

MDNR wants to see the closure reports. Contractor is working on them, will send them to Mr. Esch, and Mr. Esch will provide to MDNR. Mr. Geller inquired as to how they knew when they'd dug to the adequate cleanup level when excavating the soils at 620. Mr. Esch said the work plan used the same method as at underground storage tanks, the photoionization detector. When they reached the level assigned in the work plan and weren't over the hundred parts per million PID



reading, they collected some bottom samples and wall samples. Those results came back lower than 200, at approximately 50 parts per million. On the Confirmatory closure samples, Still waiting for laboratory validation from all those samples and their final report, but preliminary indication is there's enough for a complete closure. Mr. Geller indicates that if that same report comes to MDNR in that fashion it's sufficient.

SANITARY SEWER PERMITS AND KC VISIT

Mr. Zuiss covered this earlier in the meeting. Mr. Esch adds that Mr. Bill Williamson, the Kansas City Sewer District, and two of his local inspectors spent half a day on site looking at the system, not only from the aspect of what the Air Force has but also what Kansas City Aviation Department has. They had not looked at this system for 23 years.

SCHEDULE NEXT BCT MEETING DATE

Tuesdays, Wednesdays and Thursdays are preferable days. It was suggested that the next meeting possibly be set up in Jefferson City. It was also suggested that if there are some known



field activities taking place or some other actions that are going to dictate other contracting meetings, it would make sense to incorporate a BCT meeting at that time.

Next meeting is tentatively set the first part of October.

OPEN FLOOR DISCUSSION

Mr. Golson comments on the latest EBSS on FOSL for Kansas City Aviation, Buildings 610, 621, 622, 623, 624, 625 and 839. There are changes to the original EBS, such as attempting to change Building 839 from Category 7 to Category 2. This change was not approved by the BCT and does not have proper documentation for a change. The attached data is insufficient to show that the category change is warranted. The BCT has the authority to make property category changes.

Mr. Esch says the EBS is an internal document of the DOD to categorize property to relay to the lessees their best knowledge of the property at that time. The EBS was also used over a year ago to meet the ERFA requirement to notify the State of the environmental condition of the property as perceived by DOD. AMDNR comments on the property will be attached to any lease. It



will show that DOD feels that because of sample results it feels that this property is a Category 2, whereas MDNR's comments will show they feel there's more investigation needed. Mr. Esch was trying to provide the data that makes them believe it's a Category 2 property, and will attach MDNR comments. These are DOD property categories and not identifying them as transferable or non-transferable according to CERFA.

Mr. Golson feels it's a BCT decision as far as a category change on a property. Mr. Geller says it was talked about early on that the category changes would be proposed formally for acceptance, and if this was their proposal they disagree with it; that it's only through concurrence of the BCT that they're planning to change the categories. In order to maintain consistency for closure and transfer of the property there should be a proposal and a vote, and if it's agreeable it's changed, if it's not, then go back and identify why it's not.

Mr. Golson says the test results attached aren't helpful. If there is no closure document then the category can't be changed. Mr. Golson would like to know what the environmental



changes were in this area since the original EBS; whether everything concerned with 839 was going to the lessee, such as the lead-lined booth; and the photocopied map that was attached didn't show any of the outbuildings from 610.

Mr. Esch says the lead-lined booth would stay and was identified as a potential solid waste problem if they wanted to dispose of it. It was agreed that these items would be addressed further in working group.

Meeting was adjourned.

